On the exposition of these objects for the motion the Senate did not think proper to appoint the committee which I proposed, and the only opportunity left me for recording the principle upon which I acted was by offering the resolutions which I did on the 10th January, 1804, and by voting against all the acts of Congress legislating upon the people of Louisised during that acasion.

all the acts of Congress legislating upon the people of Louisiana during that session.

"Let me repeat that all these questions as to the extent of the powers of Congress were at that time new unsettled. In forming my judgment upon them, I had recourse only to the faculties of my own understanding, to the letter of the constitution, to the first principles of society and government, as recognised in our republican institutions, and to the light of the discussions in both houses of Congress upon that occasion. There was no precedent upon the record. The annexation of a foreign people to the North American confederacy formed a new era in our national annals. The principles upon which that great change in our condition was to be effected, and the forms by which it was to be made lawful, conformably to the true theory of human rights, involved considerations of a magcrue theory of human rights, involved considerations of a mag-nitude of which we are not yet all aware. The laws of that sension relative to Louisiana have very recently been followed as precedents in the annexation to this Union of the territory and people of Florida. In the perfectly regular exercise, and people of Florida. In the pertectly regular exercise, and for purposes of the most rigorous justice of powers identical with those assumed and granted by that little section which I have quoted, you have recently witnessed scenes against which the halls of Congress, the streets of your cities, the summits of your mountains, and the echoes of your valleys, have resounded with clamors of violated rights and unconstitutional acts of despotism. It was not in the exercise leys, have resounded with clamors of violated rights and un-constitutional acts of despotism. It was not in the exercise by General Jackson in 1824 of powers so incompatible with all our institutions—it was in the assumption and grant by Con-gress of those powers in 1803 that the real constitutional ques-tion was involved; and it is no small satisfaction to me that I am enabled to refer you to those very votes which General Smyths imputes to unworthy motives for proof that from the am enabled to refer you to those very votes which General Smythe imputes to unwo thy motives for proof that from the first day that I was called to act in your public councils I have held the Government of your Union to be a Government of fimited powers; that Congress could not lawfully exercise any powers not granted to them by the people in the constitution, and that powers in themselves of a transcendental nature cannot be assumed by construction as incidental to the expressed powers of apparent import so much more limited than themselves.

"Among the citizens who in 1803 and 1804 voted for all these laws relating to Louisiana, there were some who, upon ques-tions of far inferior magnitude, according to my conception, have been less liberal in their indulgence to constructive pow-ers. It is not for me either to question their motives or to re-

eir opinions with themselves." Indeed, I think, Mr. President, that all candid men will acknowledge that the vital principle of popular sovereignty, set forth so strongly in this letter of Mr. Adams, is quite discinctly asserted in the last of those resolutions introduced in the year 1849 by Mr. Calboun, which, with the view of strengthening my attitude, if possible, in the estimation of the from Florids, I will now read. It runs thus:

"Resolved, That it is a fundamental principle in our politi cal creed that a people, in forming a constitution, have the unconditional right to torm and adopt the government which they may think best to secure their liberty, prosperity, and trappiness; and that, in conformity thereto, no other condition is imposed by the Federal Constitution on a State in order to be admitted into this Union a secure that its der to be admitted into this Union, except that its constitu-tion shall be republican; and that the imposition of any other by Congress would not only be in violation of the constitution, but in direct conflict with the principle on which our political

Now, Mr. President, I think we see here pretty plainly what was the doctrine of the Republican party of 1823. At that time Mr. Adams was a member of it, as I have already said, and highly esteemed as such. We see on what principles he act-We see plainly ed when in the Senate of the United States. that in Virginia, and throughout the Union at large, when there was a great outery in favor of what is called the "State rights doctrines," Mr. Adams's letter was recognised as entirely unexceptionable in its character. No man then was considered a madman, or a traitor to the S uth, who adhered to and asserted the great fundamental principles of civil liberty. To these principles I have been heretofore a devotee, and expect ain such to the end of my public career; and I will add, that, could I renounce these principles now, or even fal-ter in my support of them, I should feel myself little worthy to represent the noble constituency who sent me here, and who have been pleased to support my humble efforts to serve them upon this floor with a degree of approbation of which one far more meritorious than myself might be justly proud. I shall not now press upon the attention of the Senate the sound principles of constitutional law contained in this letter of Mr. Adams. It is unnecessary, for he has so distinctly presented them, and so cogently enforced them also, that no man whose mind is properly constituted, and who is friendly at heart to our free institutions, can fail to accord to them his hearty homage and support. But if the doctrines promulgated by Mr. Adams in 1823, as a republican Presidential candidate, are thus entitled to favorable consideration, I should like to know how it happens that the rights of property should be protected in the Territories. It is impossible, sir, that in this matter I can be mistaken. Now, it so happens that a stronger amendment than the one now upon your table has, on a previous consistency in the Oregon territorial bill, a proviso was inserted far stronger than we now propose. On the 16th of January, 1847, the following proviso was attached to the Oregon bill to the other House or rather the hill present the following proviso was attached to the Oregon bill to the other House or rather the hill present the hill present the hill present the hill present the following proviso was attached to the Oregon bill the other House or rather the hill present the following proviso was attached to the Oregon bill the other House or rather the provisor that the rights of property should be protected in the Territories. It is impossible, sir, that in this matter I can be mistaken. Now, it so happens that a stronger amendment than the one now upon your table has, on a previous constitution that the rights of property should be protected in the Territories. It is impossible, sir, that in this matter I can be mistaken. Now, it so happens that a stronger amendment than the one now upon your table has, on a previous constitution of the one now upon your table has, on a previous constitution of the one now upon your table has, on a previous constitution of the one now upon your table has, on a previous constitution of the one now upon your table has, on a previous constitution of the one now upon your table has, on a previous consti we hear gentlemen who profess to belong to the State Rights in the other House, or rather the bill passed the House on strict construction school, claiming for Congress not only author that day. thority to establish Territorial Governments, but authority also to enact laws designed to have the effect in the Territories of the Union, either of imparting additional force and dignity to rights already amply secured by the constitution itself, or which, if not so secured, can have no existence at all, for want of compatibility with that sacred instrument? How is it that gentlemen who have been heretofore so jealous of all attempts on the part of Congress to legislate on the subject of African slavery, and who have, with good reason too, professed to fear that any act of legislation upon this delicate subject, however trivial and unimportant in its character, might serve as a forerunner to acts of aggression upon the rights of the that these very gentlemen, or that even a single one of this class of persons, can reconcile it to his sense of propriety, to ask, yea,

which the most subtle and ingenious reasoner that public has ever produced, has never been able to show had the least possible claim to exist, even as an over-trained im-I confess that I find myself totally incapable of unplication? I confess that I find myself totally incorporate at this derstanding the course of certain honorable gentlemen at this derstanding the course of certain honorable gentlemen at this moment, and I do most seriously fear that they are not so fortunate as perfectly to understand themselves, and as clearly to the natural and inevitable consequences of their own acts as it would be desirable they should be able to do at a moment so full of danger to the South, and to the whole Union. More especially is the conduct of these gentlemen surprising, an unconstitutional enactment, will be so much more easily and legitimately obtained from the Territorial Governments

to demand, at the hands of Congress positive legislation of a most substantial and vital character, which, if it shall once take

place with the sanction of the South, either express or im-

plied, must inevitably draw after it, and without much delay.

too, a sweeping Congressional enactment, which will utterly

exterminate our favorite domestic institution, and plunge the

whole South in hopeless and remediless ruin ? How is it

that professed strict constructionists can contend for the ex-

when they shall have been duly organized, whose solemn duty it will be to afford protection, security, and a prosperous vitality to all rights of property of whatever kind or deexciption not incompatible with the constitution of the United States. This obligation to afford protection to rights of property in general will, of course, have a peculiarly forcible application to those rights of property specially guarantied by the constitution itself.

Mr. COOPER, of Pennsylvania, (from his seat,) gested a remarkable coincidence between the recent speech o

Mr. FOOTE. Yes, sir, it is true that such coincidence does exist, and I was so much struck with it as almost to feel some surprise at learning from my honorable friend from Michigan that he had not recently seen Mr. Adams's letter, and that he had indeed no distinct recollection of having ever read it at all. I should have suggested this coincidence anyself, but for the fact that I am regarded by some as having an overweening admiration for the distinguished Senstor from Michigan, and a very particular sympathy in his political

Mr. President, I expect to be ascalled on account of my having undertaken thus frankly and unreservedly to declare my wiews upon this profoundly interesting and important sub-ject. It is almost impossible that I shall be so fortunate as to escape attack both here and elsewhere. Thank Heaven, though, I am prepared to meet all such hostility; let it but come in a courteous and parliamentary form, and I shall gladly encounter it. My conduct about this whole matter has been open and undisguised, and I undertake to say has them marked with as much consideration for the opinions and feelings of others as could in reason be demanded. Feeble as are my powers as a debater, I feel that I sam ready to defend myself and my opinions against all who may choose to wage war upon either. My motives know are b youd question, and I do not dread any scrutiny which may be instituted in regard to them. I profess to be a guide. conservative, in the most expanded and most exalted meaning of that term. I perceive plainly that ultraism in both sections of the confederacy is beginning to put on an aspect decidedly menacing. I have learned through the Union that a systematic effort will be probably made to induce the Nashville Convention to demand certain constitutional amendments, known to be impossible of attainment, a a sine qua non to a settlement of existing differences between the North and the South. But for the asserted respectability of the gentleman to whose letter in the Union I have just refeered, and the fact of its publication having been made und Congress, I should not have deemed it necessary thus to notice its appearance at all. But, looking upon the positions assumed in that letter to be of a nature highly objectionable, and even misc invous, I have felt bound not to pass it by withput notice, though I will notice it without the least in ention of eaying more than that I solemnly protest against its demands. Mr. President, I confess that I am ambitious of cooperating with patriotic men of all parties at this fearful and perplexing ensis, in preserving the safety and honor of the in power. uth, without endangering in the least the safety and honor of the North, and in preserving and percetuating our free in-

sody of ar countrymen, but which have been so alarmingly enfeebles ate, and which it is to be feared are at this moment in danger of utter extinction. This is the complexion and extent of my ambition, and I devoutly beseech the Alignment of the Senate extracts from the strongest in the subject of the Senate extracts from the strongest in the subject of the Senate extracts from the strongest in the subject of the Senate extracts from the strongest in the subject of the Senate extracts from the strongest in the subject of the Senate extracts from the strongest in the subject of the Senate extracts from the strongest in the subject of the Senate extracts from the strongest in the subject of the subject of the Senate extracts from the strongest in the subject of the Senate extracts from the strongest in the subject of the Senate extracts from the strongest in the subject of the sension of California, and then to show that these sentiments were fully constitution, occasion, contempt, and even in famy; and yet does it seem to me that I shall be able to endominate the same time, admitted by my adversaries that my happy and the free institutions have been. Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. BERRIEN. Will the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. BERRIEN. Will the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. BERRIEN. Will the Senator from Malabama allow me to interrupt him a moment? He has unintentionally fallen, my poor exertions, from the extracted in by the Senator from Measure of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. BERRIEN. Will the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. BERRIEN. Will the Senator from Measure of the Senator from Measure my poor exertions, from the overthrow with which they are both now threatened by sectional jealousies, by fierce and firry fanaticism, by untempered zeal, and, it may be, in part also, by a selfish and unscrupulous ambition for local ascendency and influence. I am aware, sir, that it has been predicted that the course which I am pursuing will not be approved by my own. a selfish and unscrupulous ambition for local ascendency and influence. I am aware, sir, that it has been predicted that the course which I am pursuing will not be approved by my own constituents. If my friends feel any apprehension on this point, I beseech them to be of good cheer. If my enemies are anticipating the discredit which they suppose is about to fall upon me from being deprived of the cheering countenance and support of those patriotic freemen who have made me all that I am as a public man, and who have generously placed me upon a theatre of action where I might mingle my energies in liberal rivalry with those eminent patriots and sages Mr. BERRIEN. That I doubt not. But, as I have stated, these were the amendments reported by the committee of the and heroes of the republic whom I see around me, for the pro-motion of the general happiness and the consummation of our motion of the general happiness and the consummation of our national glory, I can assure them that they will be doomed to utter disappointment. I do not in the least degree doubt that my conduct here will stand approved by those to whom I am chiefly responsible; but, even if it be my fate to incur condemnation where I have hoped for approval, I shall never regret for an instant what I am now doing; and I feel authorized to close this hasty and irregular speech with a prediction that the indications now so apparent every where in favor of the thing in the cale mations of twenty millions of the twenty millions of t the plan of settlement before us will continue to multiply upon our vision, until the acclamations of twenty millions of which is to mark the year 1850 as the most happy and most glorious in our national annals.

Mr. CLEMENS. As the Senator from Mississippi (Mr.

FJOTE) has concluded his remarks with a formal and announcement that this compromise scheme will pass, and, moreover, that it is to receive the warm and cordial approval American people-as I have heard this same and ment made here before—as I have seen it often in the public press, I hope that I also may be allowed to express an opinion upon the subject. I tell the Senator that, notwithstanding upon the subject. I ten the Seanatr tan, nowmeanance, his seeming confidence, it is wholly impossible for this bill to pass without material amendment. It is lingering through a wretched existence now by the mere sumerance.

We could have strangled it at its birth—three of us could have killed it yesterday—we can lay it on the table to day.

Mr. FOOTE. If the Senator will allow me, I will explain that I did not wish to be understool as being opposed to amendments, but exactly the contrary. I am in favor of various amendments to the bill; and the reason that I objected to the vote of the Senator from Florida in favor of laying it upon the table yesterday was, that he seemed to me to be laboring to preclude all amendment.

I know the Senator has repeatedly that they had a right so to do, and that her admission was no faciling. wretched existence now by the mere sufferance of its enemies. We could have strangled it at its birth—three of us could

make it more acceptable; but it so happens that we never can propose an amendment which is acceptable to him. When his colleague (Mr. Davis) offers an amendment not half so strong as one proposed a little more than three years ago to another bill, and which then met the full approbation of the entire South, the Senator finds out that it is a " hideous usurpation"—something unheard of before—a weakening of the just cause of the South, and little short of treason to her

Mr. FOOTE. Will my friend allow me to say that I cautiously avoided saying a word in relation to that amend-ment? On the contrary, I said distinctly, on yesterday, that though I did not deem the amendment of my colleague at all necessary, yet that I might possibly vote for it in a spirit of

Mr. CLEMENS. The honorable Senator will pardon me for saying that, although he did not say the amendment itself was hideous, he did say that for Congress to pass an affirmative amendment of that character would be a hideouusurpation of power, and he did say that it was something new and unheard of before. In reply to the Senator from Florida, (Mr. Yuler,) he repeatedly declared that he did no ask for any affirmative declaration, on the part of Congress, that the rights of property should be protected in the Territo-

"Provided. That no provisions of such laws, or of any act "Provided, That no provisions of such laws, or of any act hereafter passed by the Legislative Assembly of said Territory, shall be so construed as to restrict citizens of any of the United States, or of any Territory thereof, from emigrating with their property and residing in said Territory, and holding and possessing their property therein, and fully participating in all the benefits, advantages, privileges, and immunities thereof, as a Territory of the United States; and all laws or parts of laws which shall prevent the full enjoyment of such rights are hereby declared null and void."

And now, sir, when we offer a similar amendment, though in a milder form, it is promptly denounced, or at least the speectes sustaining it are denounced, in the strongest terms, and that, too, by a Southern Senator. Were still, the Senator will have it that the Senator from Florida (Mr. YULEE) gave utterance to sentiments which he has again and again repudiated. He arraigns a brother Senator, and insists upon trying him for opinions he does not hold. He chooses to rely upon his own recollection, and the loose report of the Re public, utterly discarding the authorized report in the Intelligencer, and the public declarations of the Senator from Florida made here to-day in the face of the Senate. Is this the manifestation of any thing like a friendly spirit either for the amendment or its advocates? Sir, I was more than astonished to hearthe Senator from Mississippi announce that he regardd it as odious and monstrous to ask an affirmance of our rights by Congress. It is what was done by every Southern man three years ago; for I have no doubt that every one of them voted for and sustained it. What, then, has brought this change about ? How does it happen that we dare not now demand what was then freely conceded?

Mr. FOOTE. Will the gentleman allow me to say that I was not in Congress at the period to which he is alluding? and I now advise him that I never approved of the proviso that he has just read. I thought at the time of its introduction, and do yet think, that the gentleman who brought i forward did not exhibit, in doing so, his accustomed discretion. I feared then all the embarrassment which has subsequently grown out of it. I am of opinion that this provise has, more or less, drawn our constitutional rights into ques-tion, and appears to imply the possession of legislative pow-ers on the part of the Territorial Government such as I believe that they cannot rightfully and constitutionally exercise. The gentleman will not fail to perceive, though, that this proviso s simply restrictive upon the Territorial Government, and might, perhaps, under the circumstances now existing, not be at all mischievous in its tendency, as merely prohibiting un-constitutional legislation; whereas the species of amendment advocated by the Senator from Florida proposes that Congress itself shall legislate in a manner deemed by me unconstitutional for the extension of slavery into the Territories.

Mr. CLEMENS. If it was an indiscretion, it was one that met the sanction of the whole South; and I can well afford to bear the share that may fall to me, when divided among so large a number.

I do not intend to do more than allude to and deny the

wild and fanciful doctrine of the Senator in relation to the "inherent right" of a handful of squatters upon the public lands to erect themselves into a sovereignty, and form a government for themselves. Neither do I wish to comment upon the authority he has brought here to sustain the position. It sounded strange to my ears to hear him reading the letters of John Quincy Adams as political truths that admitted of no denial. I do not mean to say any thing of Mr. Adams but what is respectful. He has gone to give an account of his conduct before a higher tribunal than this. That he was a great man, no one will deny-a man of deep learning, of many and varied attainments-but I never heard before that it was allegether safe for a Southern men to consult him a an eracle. I recollect his celebrated declaration that h would rejoice to see the day of emancipation come, even if i flooded the whole South with blood. He is no authority fo me, and if the Senator chooses to rely upon him, I can only say that, in my opinion, he has selected a most dangerous

Mr. President, among the many singular developments with which this compromise committee and compromise bill have caused us to be favored, not the least remarkable is the separate attitudes essumed by the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Clay) and his co-laborer, the Senator from Mississippi, (Mr. Foors,) towards the present Administration. The Senator from Kentucky has emphatically declared that the policy of non-action is the most ruinous that can be adopted; that is nothing short of a flagrant disregard of a sacred du y. On the other hand, the Senator from Mississip, i tells us that Congress has no constitutional power to establish Territorial evernments, and thus broadly and unqualifiedly endorses the recommendation of the President. If the Senator is right, the President has done his duty, and his duty only. Thus we have exhibited the spectacle of a leading Democrat sustainwe have exhibited the spectacle of a leading Democrat sustaining a Whig Administration upon the most important of all its measures, while the great leader of the Whig party of the this explanation; and I say again that the Senator from Union—the one who has done more than any other man, or than all other men, to build it up—finds himself constrained to any extent and in any manner suited to his own taste. assail and oppose the Chief Magistrate his party have placed Politics, as well as misery, sometimes make strange bedfellows, and produce curious results.

Not long since, Mr. President, the S nator from Mississepp

attations for the benefit of countless generations yet to exercise. I wish to assist in re-establishing those ties of fractional sill ction which once so strongly bound together the whole

these were the amendments reported by the committee of the Senate, but were not adopted; and the subject did not go to

the plan of settlement before us will continue to multiply sppi (Mr. Foote) was entitled to the ment of consistency, upon our vision, until the acclamations of twenty millions of people shall be heard to break forth upon the consummation of that scheme of peace, of conciliation, and of compromise, which is to mark the year 1850 as the most happy and most fective, or he must have a remarkable facility for changing his opinions. On yesterday he announced with great emphasis that he was as ultra as any Southern man in Congress; today he says he is no ultraist, and invites assaults from men o

that character.
Mr. FOOTE. Will the honorable Senator allow me say simply that when I employed the word ultra to-day I insay simply that when I employed the word ultra to-day I intended, as will plainly appear from the context from which he is now striving to detach it, ultraism o the ixind which demands impracticable amendments of the constitution, through the agency of the Nashville Convention? Without the least disrespect to any one, I will say that I meant to declare that I was not an ultraist of the Wigfall genus.

Mr. CLEMENS. Nor am I. Thave never asked for an amendment of the constitution. I have never believed to the constitution.

oncession to Northern feeling.

Mr. FOOTE. I stated distinctly when I was upon that topic, on yesterday, and when the Chair very proprly called me to order, that I was still opposed to the admission of California as a separate measure, and could only consut to the act of admission as a part of a general plan of conpromise. I say so yet, and would look upon its separate achission as authorizing the strongest measures of resistance or the part of the South.

Mr. CLEMENS. The Senator argued at somi length to prove that there was no concession on either side; and certainly if this dectrine of inherent right be correct, no one has any right to question the propriety of what the Californians have done. Let us see if he has always hed similar opinions. I have here a letter addressed by the Snator and his colleagues to John A. Quitman, Governor of the State of Mr. FOOTE. If the gentleman will allow me, I will state

very frankly the circumstances connected with the drawing up and signing of that letter before he reads it, leaving it then his own discretion to make any use he please of it. I did so happen one day, during the session of this body, that a letter was handed to me, addressed to the Governor of Mississippi, and subscribed by several of my colleagues, having reference to the movement then in progress in the House of Representatives for the separate admission of Calfornia as a State into the Union. Being exceedingly occupied at the State into the Union. Being exceedingly occupied at the time, and having the most unlimited confidence it those who sent the communication to me for my signature I signed it without any special examination of its contents. After an hour or two the idea suggested itself to my mind that, as the matter to which it related was of great inportance, it would be well enough to request that the letter should not be sent to the post office until it could be more particularly looked into. The proper steps were taken for its detention accordingly, and a meeting of the Representatives and Senators from Mississippi was called for the ensuing night at the room from Mississippi was called for the ensuing night, at the room of one of our colleagues. This meeting took place, and the letter first drawn up being regarded as more or less objectionable, I sat down at the writing table and sketched such a communication as I thought best, which had the fate also of being rejected. A third letter was then, rather hastily, drawn up by one of my colleagues, which is the one now in the hands of the honorable Senator from Alabama; which, being agreeable to all my colleagues then present, I did not object to, and subscribed it. In that letter it was stated that, in the opinion of us all, the admission of California, under existing circum stances, would be equivalent to the adoption of the Wilmo I still think, as I then thought, and have repeated ly declared in debate here, that such act of admission, as a separate, substantive act, would be, if any thing, worse than the Wilmot proviso; and it is only as part of a general scheme of compromise that I could vote for the admission at all. The letter, as will be seen, failed to suggest this distinction, as was but natural, inasmuch as the scheme of compromise now under consideration had not then been introduced. I had some slight objection to the letter at the time, in reference to this point, but, from respect to my colleagues, all the rest of whom, then present, were satisfied with it, I forbore to express it. But I did so a few days thereafter, to one of my colleagues now present, as he will, if necessary, attest. This is the whole affair, so far as I now recollect it, which will be seen by all to be of rather an unimportant character to be thus formally introduced to the notice of the Senate. But, as the Senator from Alabama seems solicitous to make some political capital out of it, he is quite welcome to make any use of it he pleases. I can assure him that my constituents are too intelligent to condemn me very harshly upon so slight a foundation as this letter can furnish Mr. CLEMENS resumed the floor, but gave way to

Mr. DAVIS, of Mississippi, who said : If the Senator from Alabama will allow me, as I amsomewhat involved in this question, and as my name has been introduced as a witness on both sides of the question, I suppose I must testify. The first fact is as my collesgue has stated. We met together; and after a long and full discussion—after rejecting one letter, writing another, and rejecting that, we agreed upon a third; that is the one we transmitted. As I understood it, we finally agreed merely to declare our view of the position in which the question then stood, and without suggesti fer it to the Legislature and people of Mississippi. After it had been determined thus to submit the question, avoiding any expression of opinion upon our side as to the course to

any expression of opinion upon our side as to the course to be pursued, I thought the letter was reduced to a statement of that which we all held to be a fact.

I did then, and do now, consider that when, without proper authority, the people of California assembled in Convention, and assumed to strip us, by their fundamental law, of the right which it had been threatened to take from us by Wilmot proviso, and when the validity of that act is de pendant upon Congressional confirmation, that such confirmation is not essentially different from the other form of direc exclusion by Congress, known as the Wilmot proviso.

Mr. FOOTE. I wish not to be misunderstood in this matter I said in the beginning that the letter was sent here by the author, and signed without examination, as I do many letters every day, in consequence of the unlimited confidence I had in the gentleman who sent it. But I say further that, during the day, I thought there was something in the phraseology which was not exactly right. Indeed, I thought it was not necessary to write any letter, and I so expressed myself. We made use of the name of one of our colleagues in the House, who happen d not to be present at the meeting, which cir-cumstance will serve to show that the transaction was at least rather loosely conducted. We did have a long conversation, and we talked about a great many Mississippi matters, which, in my judgment, had an important connexion with the in-terests of that State. We discussed the first letter for a time, and then my letter was draughted. I was willing to sign that and to stand by it forever. After that, the letter of my colleague in the other House was draughted, who had draughted the first one, if I understand the matter correctly. Having a great regard for him, I did not wish to be hypercritical; in fact, I did not examine the letter perhaps as closely as should have done, for I did not wish to wear the appearance of seeking a disagreement with colleagues so much esteemed.

I certainly at the time, as my colleague knows, had some ittle doubt as to the expediency of the movement; but I must say I have so much of the spirit of compromise and harmony about me, and I wish so much to fraternize with my colleagues, that I did not hesitate to sign the letter at all; and no doubt Honorable Senators here know, and the country knows, the importance which I have constantly attached to uniting the Territorial and State bills, and how hard I have struggled against the admission of California as a separate and distinc

As to the charge of inconsistency, in the first place I am not guilty as charged; secondly, if guilty in the precise manner and form alleged, I am not apprehensive of receiving any very serious punishment at the hands of my generous-hearted constituents for an offence so trivial. I will inform the honorable gentlemen that I do not set up any claims to absolute consistency, and I have always held such claims, by whomsoever set up, as not a little ridiculous. I have been guilty of inconsistencies at different periods of my political life far more serious than the one specified. It was my misfortune once even to err so far as to abandon for a few months the Democratic party. That is to say, I did not act with it for a short period of time. But the people of Mississippi did not punish me very signally for this; on the contrary, they nobly forgave me, and sent me here to labor for the safety and happiness of the republic, without As to the charge of inconsistency, in the first place I am labor for the safety and happiness of the republic, without any regular solicitation of that high honor at their hands—as several now present know that I was sent here whilst avow-ing my desire that a distinguished friend of mine should be selected in my place. I can assure the honorable gentleman that he can amuse himself with that letter as long as he pleases, as I am not apprehensive of receiving the least detriment from it here or elsewhere.

Mr. DAVIS. Will the Senator from Alabama allow me

o say a word merely in explanation of this latter point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is under the necessity of interposing. This is a matter not germane to the subject under consideration. Senators must be strictly restricted in their remarks to the subject-matter under discussion.

The Senator from Alabama will proceed.

Mr. CLEMENS. As the Senator has objected to my reading the letter, I will let that pass. I propose to try him by the Congressional record—by opinions not only delibe-rately uttered, but deliberately revised and corrected. I shall read from one of my own speeches, which was fully endorsed at the time by the honorable Senator from Mississippi. The extract is in reply to a question by the Senator tucky:

tucky:

"I answer that every thing conceded by the admission of California. The whole matter in controversy terminates at once. The North gets all she has ever asked—gets it by the action of Congress, and in direct violation of the great legal principle that the wrong-doer shall not profit by his own wrong.

"Who among us does not know that agitation in the State Legislatures and in the national Congress has prevented Southern emigration to California, and placed the country in the power of those who have imposed this restriction? Who is there so blind as not to see that this has been the result of aggressions commenced here? And who does not feel that is there so blind as not to see that this has been the result of aggressions commenced here? And who does not feel that Congress is responsible for the fact that slavery has been excluded? Property is proverbially timid. The slaveholder would not carry his property there with a threat hanging over him that it was to be taken away by operation of law the moment he landed. Agitation, then, in Congress—repeated declarations made every where—in State Legislatures—in conventions—in the public press—from the pulpit even—that slavery should be excluded by law, has deprived us of our constitutional rights as certainly and effictually as any positive enactment could have done, and we are not only asked to submit to it, but to accept it as a boon, and be very thankful for an outrage. Sir, I prefer the Wilmot proviso direct. I prefer it because it is bolder, plainer, and more manly. The robber who meets me on the highway, and demands the surrender of my property, leaves me at least the option of a contest, and is entitled to far more respect than the assassin who lurks behind a corner and stabs in the dark. So, sir, he who undertakes to deprive me of my legal rights by open means, is always entitled to higher respect than he who seeks to accomplish the same end by deception and trickery. I hold that whatever opposition is due to the Wilmot proviso, whatever resistance it demands, is doubly due to this scheme of smuggling a sovereign State into the Union."

This is strong language certainly, but it was not too strong for the teste of the Senete for Michael and the strong language certainly, but it was not too strong for the teste of the Senete for Michael and the surface of the strength of the same end by deception in the union."

This is strong language certainly, but it was not too strong for the taste of the Senator from Mississippi at that time. He endorsed it fully. I suppose he thinks it but little short of treason now.

At this point the honorable Senator gave way to

Mr. BUTLER, who moved that the further consideration f the subject be pos poned till Monday next. The Senate then proceeded to the consideration of Execu-ive business, and after some time spent therein, the doors ere re-opened, and then on motion the Senate adjourned.

MONDAY, MAY 20, 1850. MIONDAY, MAY 20, 1850.

The California bill being again under consideration—
Mr. CLEMENS said: Mr. President, when the Senate last adjourned, I was examining the course pursued by the Senator from Mississippi, (Mr. Foote,) and attempting to show that if the opposers of this bill were justly chargeable with ultraism, we could at least plead his example in extenuation. The task was an ungrateful one to me on many accounts. The Senator from Mississippi and myself represent adjoining and kindred States. Our own personal relations have been of the kindest character. I hope and believe they will continue to be so. There were other reasons, also, which will continue to be so. There were other reasons, als , which impelled me strongly to avoid any controversy with him, however courteous in its character. Even of er it was begun, in I had determined to say nothing more upon the subject. But the course which has been since pursued by the advocates of this bill renders it impossible for me now to close. The extraordinary efforts which have been made to manufacture public sentiment in its favor, and the denunciations burled gainst those who, from a deep sense of duty, have expressed heir opposition to a scheme of compromise so delusive and so angerous, demand an exposure of its deformities. Certain etter-writers from this city have been industriously engaged in misrepresenting the acts and assailing the motives of those who, in common with myself, believe this to be a shameless surrender—not a compromise. One in particular has admonished me that the Senator from Mississippi holds a proud position in a great national party, and therefore he cannot afford sition, and I hope he may always retain it. I hope, also hat the people of the South may take the view of the ques tion suggested, and, while repudisting his doctrines, that they may still cherish the kindest feelings for the man. It may not be amiss, however, to say a few words of this thing called national reputation. It is something I value very lightly. We are apt to prize objects in proportion to the difficulties which attend the pursuit; and, estimated by this rule, national reputation is of quite too easy attainment to be sought with any great avidity. We all know a process by which any of us may secure it. It is not even beyond my grasp We all know a process by which should only have to turn traitor to my convictions of duty and abandon the interests of the South, to change entirely th otes of that whole pack of curs who are now yelping at my eels. Sir. I want no national reputation purchas ed at such price. I spurn it as I would any other foul and loathsom

ing. When the Senator from Mississippi addressed us, the other day, he took occasion to inform us that he did not regard consistency as any great virtue, after all. Perhaps he was right. In some degree, I certainly agree with him. A mere mortal, whose judgment can never be clear and perfect, ought not to adhere with blind and dogged obstinacy to all his opinions. t may be my fault to cling to mine with too much tenseity till, I think of the two extremes it is the best. I must think better to hold on to opinions once deliberately uttered than a sequire the habit of changing them with every change of the moon. How far the Senator is justly liable to the last charge will appear in the progress of my remarks. He has constituted himself the advance guard of the grand compromise army. He has assumed to deliver lectures here upo a the dangerons tendencies of ultraism. I propose to she we that, if it be a sin, it is one of which he has himself so lat ely repented, that he has hardly had time to obtain forgiveness. He has not only endorsed the strongest language ever use I by me, but he has gone very far beyond me. On Thursday I7 end to the Senate an extract from my own remarks, and said that, strong as this language was, it was not too strong for 'the taste of the Senator from Mississippi at that time. I s' all now read his endorsement. In reply to the Senator from Ken-

"Sir, had the honorable Senator confined hir aself to the "Sir, had the honorable Senator confined hir uself to the propounding of terms of settlement, however unfair and oppressive to the South, or had he been unate ated to advocate the resolutions of compromise which he he is introduced here with all his well known eloquence, I should not have been disposed to complain of him in the least. Though I certainly concur with my esteemed friend from Alabama, who has spoken to-day with a strength and brill aney seldom, if ever, surpassed in this body, in all that he I as said touching the true character and effect of the resolutions of the Senator from Kentucky; though I certainly agree with the Senator from Alabama, that these resolutions yield up the whole ground of controversy to our insatiate adversaries; though the round of controversy to our insatiate adv ersaries; though the peech of the honorable Senator from Kr. ntucky, in support of ground of controversy to our insatiate adv ersaries; though the speech of the honorable Senator from Kr. ntucky, in support of these resolutions of his, was, in some "respects, highly objectionable, both in phraseology and iv, substance, yet I could have borne all this patiently, and did do so. I could have remained silent, or contented myself with a solemn protest sgainst his course. But, sir, the honorable: Senator from Kentucky has thought proper to play the o ensor upon this occasion. He has deemed himself authorized to disapprove, in strong and pointed language, of what he s been said by Southern Senators relative to the dangers which are now so fiercely menacing the Union, and those dire results which all must at last perceive will be the inevitable fruit of that aggressive policy against which the South has been so long and so zealously contending."

Now, Mr. President, I wish it to be remembered that my remarks applied exclusively to the admission of California. I had spoken upon no other subject—alluded to no other matter. The Senator from Mississippi avowed his full concurrence in all that I had said, and thus directly asserted that the admission of California was worse than the Wilmot provise itself. Let me ask him if he would be willing to-day to

clated to be worse? Sir, this is a dilemma from which there can be no escape. Whether singly or as part of a general scheme, that which is worse than the Wilmot proviso can never be sanctioned by the South, without a total abandonment of all claim to equal rights under the constitution. On the same occasion the Senator sought an opportunity to denounce, with great bitterness, the resolutions offered in the early part of the session by the Senator from Kentucky. I have asserted, and I still maintain, that those resolutions and this scheme are substantially the same. The Senator from Kentucky himself, when called on to point out the difference, could think of but one—and that was the omission in the recould think of but one—and that was the omission in the re-port of two truths, as he called them, contained in the reso-lutions—the one of law, the other of fact: the one, that lutions—the one of law, the other of fact: the one, that slavery was excluded from the Territories by the law of Mexico—the other, that it was excluded by the law of God. Well, sir, if these two truths were omitted in the report, they were not omitted in the speech which accompanied and explained it. In that speech the Senator from Kentucky reaffirmed his two truths in the most emphatic manner. He did more. He avowed that his object was to leave the laws of Mexico in force, and exclude slavery forever. I do not intend to leave this matter in doubt. I read from the speech of the Senator from Mississippi who sits behind me, (Mr. DAVIS :)

of the Senator from Mississippi who sits behind me, (Mr. Davis:)

"But the Senator from Kentucky has avowed his purpose that the lex loci shall remain; that the right to hold this property shall be determined by the lex loci. Now, this strikes me as strange, coming from one who, two days since, in language so decided, so eloqent, even fervent, arraigned the non-action policy of the Administration, which would leave the local law still in force. To us, where is the difference? The Senator's view, equally with the policy he condemns, would prevent our Southern citizens from going there with this species of property; and, though I do agree with him as to the continuance of Mexican laws, his position shows the extent to which our rights are to be respected and maintained. This is important to me, though, in common with most Southern men, I hold that the law of Mexico was repealed (except within the narrow limits of the relations of persons and property pre-existing and remaining in the country) on the acquisition of the territory. That is my opinion; and I hold that no political law exists in the country to which this bill refers, except those resulting from the legislation of Texas. The Senator from Kentucky holds a different opinion; and therefore it is to his opinion that my remarks apply. His object is to leave the laws of Mexico in force. If I misunflerstand the Senator, I will listen to his correction.

"Mr. CLAY. The Senator understands me perfectly?"

"Mr. CLAY. The Senator understands me perfectly."

And yet, after all this, the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. Foore) announced in our hearing that he liked the speech better than he did the report. O, what miserable work we make of it, when the hard task is imposed upon us of sustaining wrong and injustice. God knows, I thought the report went far enough; but there were others, it seems, who preferred a more unequivocal avowal that the rights and interests of the Scath was the seems. of the South were to be utterly disregarded. There was a time when the Senator from Mississippi held other opinions. There was a time when he did not hesitate to denounce such sentiments in terms of eloquent indignation beyond my pow-ers to equal. Sir, let me read to him his own language—let me refresh his recollection of his own just and generous seniments. Even now, it may not be too late to recall him to the path from which be has wandered so widely:

timents. Even now, it may not be too late to recall him to the path from which he has wandered so widely:

"On several occasions in Congress the honorable Senator has been known in former years to exhibit himself, more or less, as a decided disapprover of the system of domestic slavery in the South. Last summer he took another step, and recommended to the people of Kentucky, in a deeply interesting letter, the adoption of a system of prospective emancipation. The publication of this letter brought on a contest in that State, which was waged heatedly and actively for several months, and not without some bloodshed, but which happily terminated in the utter defeat of this plan of emancipation. A short time since the free-soilers of Ohio, and I believe of several other States, held a Convention at Cleveland, at which they adopted resolutions more objectionable to the South than any which had antecedently appeared. A committee of this Convention wrote a letter to the honorable Senator from Kentucky, to which he replied, approving fully the objects of their assemblage, and giving his assent to their general doctrines. Such was the predicament of the honorable Senator when he came among us at this session; and what has been his course here? Why, sir, I feel bound to admit that the honorable Senator has been quite consistent. His first important movement was the introduction of his resolutions of compromise. And what are these resolutions? Why, one of them is formally declarative of the hated Wilmot proviso principle; another brings in California; another, by inevitable implication, asserts the power of Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia; another proposes to abolish the slave trade in the District of Columbia; another proposes to abolish the slave trade in the District of Columbia; another proposes to abolish the slave trade in the District of Columbia and all this is to be conceded by the South without any compensating advantages whatever. I am certainly not a great deal surprised that such terms

ompromise.
"And what sort of a speech was that by which these resolutions were accompanied? Why, sir, I undertake to say that there is more in the sentiments and language of that speech to mortify Southern sensibilities, to awaken dissatisfaction, and mortify Southern sensibilities, to awaken dissatisfaction, and to provoke resentment, too, as well among all who are not quite convinced as I am of the purity of the honorable Senator's motives, than we find in any speech of professed abolitionists, not excepting even the far-famed Garrison, and Philips, and Douglass. Certainly no speech at all approximating to this one of the honorable Senator from Kentucky has ever been delivered before in either house of Congress. I will not particularize; but I am sure that all who have read that meach will admit that I have done it but simple inside. that speech will admit that I have done it but simple justice. Why, sir, a speech so replete with offensive doctrine—so dog-Why, sir, a speech so replete with offensive doctrine—so dog-matical and overbearing in its tone—so menacing in its spirit, no man but one possessing the moral prowess which is emi-nently distinguishes the honorable Senator from Kentucky, could ever have been able to enunciate. I am sure that the honorable Senstor from New York (Mr. Sewand) will never honorable Senstor from New York (Mr. Seward) will never dare to deliver such a speech here; the honorable Senator from New Hampshire, (Mr. Hall,) with all that rhetorical heroism which he displayed among us the other day, would recoil from the utterance of much that fell with an easy grace from the lips of the honorable Senator from Kentucky; and the honorable gentleman from Ohio, (Mr. Chase,) I am confident is to moderate and forheasis, it his composition of the control of the of the contro the honorable gentleman from Ohio, (Mr. Chase,) I am confi-dent, is too moderate and forbearing in his temper ever to de-liver such a philipie as this against the whole system of do-mestic slavery, and against the efforts of the Southern States of the Confederacy to protect themselves against menaced ag-gressions. Sir, I feel that no other member of the Senate, besides the Senator from Kentucky, could have pronounced such a speech in the hearing of Southern men, without calling forth a response full of indignation and asperity."

I hope the Senator from Mississippi will compare the first peech which he assailed so bitterly with that speech for which he has expressed such extraordinary admiration. I am suce, that comparison will reveal, to him the most extraordinary. change of opinion and position which even his experience has

Mr. President, there is not an important feature of this ompromise of which the Senator from Mississippi has not, at one time or another, expressed strong disapprobation. How it happens that jumbling them all together has removed so many deformities, and added so many beauties, is something which passes my comprehension. When the Seneter from Missouri (Mr. Benton) introduced a bill to purchase a portion of Texas, and establish the boundaries of the remain the Sonator from Mississippi at once discovered that it was a proposition pregnant with the most terrible dangers to the South. He distinctly affirmed that every foot of territory so purchased "would be claimed infallibly as subject to the Wilmot proviso." Then, after commenting upon certain re-

solutions adopted by Northern Legislatures, he adds:

"Yes, sir, all these things I knew, and, I hope, duly appreciated; but never did it enter my head to especive that there was in existence a human being—a membar of this illustrious body, too, representing among us one of the slave States of the confederacy—who would dare to take it upon himself to bring forward a bill like that which has made its ghastly apparition among us this morning, and whish, if it become a law without amendment, will completely unsettle the question of slavery in all the vast domain which it proposes to purchase from the State of Texas.

"The bill now brought forward, as will be perceived by those who will examine it, nullifies this Missouri compromise principle in all the territory proposed to be purchased, and every acre of it is placed in the same plight and condition precisely as California and our other recently acquired possessions."

It is well the Senator informed us that he had no great re-

It is well the Senator informed us that he had no great regard for consistency. He proposes now to cut off ten de-grees of latitude from the State of Texas—enough for three free States—which we have his authority for saying will be infallibly subject to the Wilmot proviso. He proposes fur-ther to tax us from ten to fifteen millions of dollars for the privilege of making them free States, and adding to the hast power now threatening to crush us; and then, by way of adding the most galling insult to the deepest injury, he demands that we shall accept this outrage as a compromise— as compensation for the admission of California. Sir, if I must take this nauseous dose at all, I mean to take it in sepa-rate parcels. I prefer that California should come in singly to coupling her admission with a surrender of ten degrees of slave territory for the formation of free States. I prefer that there should be an open exercise of power, rather than an insidious compromise which not only surrenders every thing a dispute, but surrenders also the right to complain or resist.

in dispute, but surrenders also the right to complain or resist. I read again from the same speech:

"My bill originally proposed to pay to Texas a specific sum, just one-half of the sum now proposed by the Senator from Missouri, for her ownership of the public lands situated in the country commonly called New Mexico, north of a line to be run in an easterly direction from the Paso del Norte to the head-waters of the Red River; cautiously reserving, though, to the territory in which the right of property in a portion of the public lands was thus to be purchased, the principle of compromise embodied in the resolutions of annexation. This reservation, it will be at once perceived, is an arrangement which cannot be dispensed with, without incurring the risk of immediately sultiplying the number of free States, and deeply endangering the whole southern section of the Union.

Union.
"This I had resolved to offer as a new scheme of compro mise; which, with the establishment of a Territorial Govern-ment in New Mexico, in Descret, and California, and the ulti-mate admission of California as a State, when freed from her

"The resolutions of Vermont, now upon your table—the incendiary messages of the Governors of Pennsylvania and Massachusetts—the truly demoniacal resolutions now before the New York Legislature—the extraordinary harangues made in this hall since we assembled—these and other facts of a kindred character satisfied me that the season for compromise had torever passed by; or that at least, if propositions of compromise were hereafter to be offered, they ought to emanate from the North. I became satisfied that the time had arrived when it behooved Southern Senators and Representatives in Congress to stand firmly and resolutely up in strict maintenance of our constitutional rights, as they were secured by our venerated forefathers; leaving it to the champions of aggression and the perpetrators of injustice to determine whether they would indeed take upon themselves and their constituents the responsibility of dissolving that Union which was once so justly dear to the heart of every American. With these views I contented myself with offering the bill which I am now asking to be allowed to introduce, curtailed of those other provisions which have been now brought forward, in a disguised form, by the honorable Senator from Missouri."

At that time the Senator would consent to no adjustment

At that time the Senator would consent to no adjustmen At that time the Senator would consent to no adjustment which did not contain an express reservation that all south of 36 degs. 30 mins should be slave territory. Now he insists upon giving up that same territory as low as the 32d parallel of latitude without any reservation whatever. Comment upon such glaring inconsistency would almost be an insult to

we learn further, sir, that he then regarded the mere offer of a compromise by a Southern man as wholly unjustifiable, weak, unmanly, and craven. I hope he will pardon us if we have learned his lessons too well; and, when called on to pass judgment upon the degree of guilt we have incurred, he will remember that, if we are not gifted with his facility for

We learn further, sir, that he then regarded the mere offer

on the 22d January, in reply to the honorable Senator from Connecticut, he favored us with a statement of certain important facts of which he has suddenly become entirely oblivious :

important facts of which he has suddenly become entirely oblivious:

"I had heretofore recognised the honorable gentleman as a regular and diligent reader of newspapers, and should have supposed it hardly possible that he should have failed to see it published in many of the now leading gazettes of the Union, as most ocertainly I did, that a member of the California Convention itself (Mr. Borrs) rose up in his place just at that precise moment when General Riley vacated the chair in the Convention which he had continued to occupy during its whole session, and said, in substance, that he felt authorized to state the fact that coercive power had been employed to bring about the state of things then existing in California, and that the constitution then about to be adopted had been forced upon the people of California. He charged further that orders had been given, in the most solemn and imposing manner, by the powers at Washington, that unless such constitution as was adopted should be to the taste of certain high personages here—perhaps including the honorable Senator from Connecticut, (for he may have admonished them on the subject by a circular for aught I know)—unless such a constitution were adopted as would be suited to the taste of distinguished gentlemen in Washington, (including the President and his Cabinet,) the whole influence of the Executive would be thrown against the admission of California as a sovereign State; and that, on the contrary, in the event of such a constitution as should prove agreeable being adopted, then that influence would be exerted, through all legitimate modes, for the purpose of bringing California into the Union as a sovereign State."

I am not a little curious to know what has removed the unfavorable impressions made upon his middle by the energing

I am not a little curious to know what has removed the unfavorable impressions made upon his mind by the enormi-ties here enumerated, or what evidence he has since received to convince him the charges are untrue. If he has any such

to convince him the charges are untrue. If he has any such evidence in his possession, he owes it to the President to retract the grave charges heretofore made.

I read now, sir, from another speech of the honorable Senator, made on the 29th of January last:

"8. If all other questions connected with the subject of slavery can be satisfactorily adjusted, I see no objection to admitting all California above the line of 36 degrees and 30 minutes into the Union; provided another new alaye State can be laid off within the present limits of Texas, so as to keep up the present equiponderance between the slave and free States of the Union; and, provided further, all this is done by way of compromise, and in order to save the Union, (as dear to me as to any man living.")

Thus we see that he was unwilling to admit even that portion of California north of 36 degrees 30 minutes, without a

tion of California north of 36 degrees 30 minutes, without a new slave State, for the purpose of keeping up the equipon-derance between the free and slave States, and not then unless-it was necessary to the salvation of the Union. What has-become of his doctrine of equiponderance now, when he not only takes California without a slave State, but gives three-

free States to her.?

On the 13th of February he embodied his opin series of resolutions, and submitted them to the Senate. The fourth resolution is in substance the same as the paragraph last read, and contains doctrine very widely different from

that he now advocates: "4. Resolved; That, in the judgment of the Senate, California is not, at the present time, absolutely entitled to admission into the Union as a State; that whether she should be admitted or not is a simple question of expediency; that it would be altogether impolities to admit her with the boundaries specified in the constitution recently adopted by her Conries specified in the constitution recently adopted by her Convention, or with a territorial surface extending south of the compromise line of 36 deg. 30 min.; that it would be unwise to grant such admission, if it should be hereafter made to appear that her present civil organization has been brought about by unfair, unconstitutional, or coercive action on the part of the Federal Government, or any of its functionaries; and that, all other impediments being removed, such admission should, under existing circumstances, only he allowed to take place under a clear and distinct understanding and agreement that a new State may be hereafter formed within the present territorial limits of the State of Texas, in accordance with the articles of Texan annexation, and be admitted into the Union at as early a period as practicable."

The ninth resolution is equally condemnatory of another-

The ninth resolution is equally condemnatory of another feature of the present compromise :

"9. Resolved, That it is inexpedient to legislate at present: in regard to the prohibition of the trade in slages in the District of Columbia, and that it is a matter which may be well left to be regulated by the municipal authorities of said District."

Mr. FOOTE. I prefer that now.

Mr. CLEMENS. I have no right to judge of his preferences. I am arguing against the bill. I find the bill which he advocates contains this provision. Lais one of the features he himeaf, has denounced. I am stating it as an objection, and I have produced his authority to scattain me.

I have now shown that every feature of this compromise,

when taken separately, has met the strong and decided dis-approval of the Senator from Mississippi. What healing vir-tue there is in tacking them all tegether, I consess myself whelly unable to comprehend. Not long since he declared, with an earnestness which left no doubt of his sincerity, that the admission of California would dissolve the Union in six

Mr. FOOTE. I think so yet. Mr. CLEMENS. The Senator says he thinks so yetmeaning her separate admission. Now, Mr. President, let me ask him if, according to his doctrine of inherent right, he me ask him it, according to his doctrine of annexem right, ne can complain of the adoption of a constitution by the people of Cahsornia? Can he, of all men, say her admission will be an outrage? Has he not precluded himself from the assumption of any such ground? He has told us that the people, whether 500 or 50%,000, have an inherent right to form pls, whether 500 or 50%,000, have an inherent right to form governments for themselves. There were certainly more than 500 people in Califoraia. According to the Senator from Misseissippi, they had an inherent right to assemble and adopt a constitution. How, then, can he venture even to vote against her admission? Will he assume to obstruct them in the exercise of an admitted and acknowledged right? Sir, I must say that the speech of the honorable Senator from Mississippi, and his unqualified endorsement of this dangerous heresy, are likely to be productive of far more disastrous consequences than all the speeches of all the free sollers together. sequences than all the speeches of all the free soilers together.

And still, after doing all he can to prove that the admission of California is no wrong, he does not hesitate to threaten us with terrible consequences if, by any act of ours, her separate admission should he hastened. Why, sir, if I could rely on the Senator's argument, and take his dicta for truths, I should unhesitatingly say that the great wrong contained in the present bill is the dismemberment of Texas. If I believed in the soundness of his views, I should at once move to separate the measures, so that California might come in, and the par-tition of Texas be rejected; but entertaining insuperable objec-tions to the whole bill in its present form, I shall, if the tions to the whole bill in its present form, I shall, if the amendments offered by myself and others are voted down, move to lay it on the table. What may then follow, I do not know. One thing, however, I do know. No consequences can deter me from acting according to the dictates of my best judgment; and that teaches me no bill can be worse than this.

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. Clar) asked us the other day what was the peccasity of quarrelling about a mat-

other day what was the necessity of quarrelling about a matter of no practical importance?—that slavery was excluded from the Territories by the law of God, and could never be introduced. I answer his question by another. If it is a matter of no importance, why can he not yield? If he has entire carfidence in the collection to the control of the con confidence in the opinion he has advanced, why insist upon a restriction which will add nothing to his security, and must go very far to irritate and inflame the Southern mind? Why does he demand that all the concessions should come from us, while he stubbornly refuses to make any himself? Concessions the stubbornly refuses to make any himself? while he stude or his set of make any himself? Concession, sir, when made by the strong, is apt to be regarded as generosity, but, when made by the weak, can never free itself from the suspicion of slavish fear. The North may well afford to make a concession on this point—we cannot.

A few more words, Mr. President, and I am done. I am told I ought to take this bill because it is the best I can get.

Sir, I do not know that; but if I did, the same argumen might be urged with equal force in favor of uncondition mission to any wrong ever perpetrated by the strong upon the